

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/347,523	07/06/1999	YOSHIYUKI GOMI	103229	3978
25944 75	590 01/25/2005		EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC			NGUYEN, DUNG T	
P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			2871	
			DATE MAILED: 01/25/2003	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summany	09/347,523	GOMI, YOSHIYUKI			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
TI MANUAL DATE A Min communication and	Dung Nguyen	2871			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timwithin the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 No	ovember 2004.				
,					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
 4) Claim(s) 4,5,7,8 and 27 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 4,5,7,8 and 27 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 					
Application Papers	•				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the confidence of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the confidence of th	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:				

Art Unit: 2871

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's amendment dated 11/10/2004 has been received and entered. By the amendment, claims 4-5, 7-8 and 27 are remain pending in the application.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 4, 7 and 27 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 4-5, 7-8 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art (APA), figure 11, in view of Ray et al., US Patent No. 5,701,008 and Fukuda, US Patent No. 5,764,323.

Regarding claims 4-5, 7-8 and 27, APA discloses an electro-optical device (figure 11) comprising:

- . a pair of substrates (30, 31);
- . an electro-optical material (39);
- . a plurality of pixels (46);
- a lens array (L) with a plurality of convex microlenses as claimed;
- . a step portion (LB);
- . a transparent cover (49) adhered to the lens;

Art Unit: 2871

a photo curing resin sealing material would be inherently forming for adhering two substrates together (see APA'S specification, page 3, lines 4-5).

APA, however, does not disclose that the step portion being substantially equal in height to the microlenses as well as a thin layer of the adhesive being disposed between the step portion and the sealing material including a height that is less than the height of the adhesive over inter lenses position adjacent to one of the microlenses. Ray et al do disclose that a step portion can be formed with the height of microlenses as well as the thin layer of the adhesive being disposed between the step portion and the sealing material width of the step portion being wider than the entire width of the sealing material (8) (e.g., upper portion of the sealing material) as shown in figure 4, and the height of the thin layer inherently formed less than that of the adhesive over inter lenses position adjacent to one of the microlenses. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify APA'S electro-optical device having a step portion which is substantially equal in height to the microlenses in order to improve the detection efficiency of detector element (i.e., pixels) (see col. 2, ln., 21). In case of no photo curing resin using for sealant, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form a photo curing resin based material because it is notoriously well known in the ad using such photo curing resin for the purpose of sealing. and it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice.

In addition, APA does not disclose the step of polishing a surface of a transparent cover after the adhering. Fukuda does disclose the step of polishing a surface of a transparent cover (73) covered micro lenses (72)(see figures 9A-9E). Therefore, it would have been obvious to

Art Unit: 2871

one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to employ the step of polishing a surface of a transparent cover after adhering to the micro lenses in the APA's method as shown by Fukuda in order to accurate alignment a focal point to each pixel when micro lenses are incorporated in an LCD panel (col. 7, ln.18).

It is noted that since the method of manufacturing the device is merely a list of forming each component and each component must be formed to make the device, the method of manufacturing would be inherent to the device.

Conclusion

- 3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- 4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2871

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dung Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-2297. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert H. Kim can be reached on 571-272-2293. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DN 01/22/2005

Dung Nguyen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2871